

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

July 10, 1975
1:00 P.M.

Council Chambers
301 West Second Street

Mayor Friedman called the meeting to order noting that all members were present.

Roll Call:

Present: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann,
Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell

Absent: None

The Invocation was delivered by RABBI JUDAH LEON FISH, Congregation Agudas Achim.

RECOGNITION

Mayor Friedman read and then presented a resolution signed by the Council to Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Hargis in recognition of the fact that Mr. Hargis had contributed much to the comfort, convenience, and welfare of the people of the City during his many years of service as sanitary engineer for the Austin-Travis County Health Department and encouraged all residents to join the Council in recognizing his outstanding efforts in behalf of all citizens. It was noted that Mr. Hargis retired on June 30 after more than 30 years of service.

Mr. Hargis thanked the Council and the citizens of Austin. He noted that this had not only been a duty but a pleasure as well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION ACTION

Mayor Friedman announced that the Council had been in an Executive Session earlier in the day and had discussed appointments to various boards and commissions that were now before the Council for action:

Community Development Commission

Mayor Pro Tem Snell moved that the Council appoint the following to the Community Development Commission:

Representatives of Public Officials:

Rev. James Obey Pat Brice
Maria Elaina Martinez Alicia Sanchez

Representatives of Private Groups:

Larry Myers Eva June Lindsey
Abigail Havens

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Linn, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers
Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino
Noes: None

Citizens Board of Natural Resources and
Environmental Quality

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council appoint CYNTHIA KEEVER to the Citizens Board of Natural Resources and Environmental Quality. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann,
Lebermann, Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman
Noes: None

Schedule of Appointments

Mayor Friedman announced that the Council would meet in an Executive Session on July 17, 1975, at 12:00 noon to consider appointments to the Landmark Commission and any other vacancies that might occur.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council approve the Minutes for July 3, 1975. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn,
Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell
Noes: None

ANNEXATION HEARING

Mayor Friedman opened the public hearing scheduled for 1:00 p.m. to consider the annexation of the following:

10.25 acres of land out of the James Rodgers Survey - Mesa Park, Phase Two, Section Three. (Requested by S. A. Garza Engineers, Inc., representing Pringle Real Estate, Inc., owner.) (Case No. C7a-75-007)

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker, Assistant Director of Planning, reviewed the annexation request by stating that it was in a large area under study, with completion anticipated in the Fall. He noted that three-fourths of this subdivision has been developed and presently annexed in the City, and all City services are currently being provided. He pointed out that the staff recommended annexation and that the applicant had been notified that he should be present, but the staff had not received any notice whether or not the applicant would appear.

In response to Councilmember Linn's questions, Mr. Knickerbocker stated that this would involve a refund contract; and the applicant was aware that the policy would be changed but was still seeking annexation.

In response to Mayor Friedman's question as to why this would be annexed now if the area was under study, City Manager Davidson pointed out that this was being requested by the owner; and in the study, a considerable amount of land was being requested by the City. He stated that the staff and applicant had assumed that the Council would continue with the former policy of annexing land to the City if it met all criteria.

Mr. Knickerbocker noted that this was an extension of an already existing subdivision. In response to Councilmember Linn's question, he did not believe it would be to the City's advantage to wait until the study of the entire area was completed in that this was a very small area.

In response to Councilmember Linn's question as to whether or not the City would be obligated to provide a refund contract for the owner, City Attorney Butler commented that it would depend on the policy at the time; and it would be up to the Council to decide what the policies were. If the policy is still in effect, he indicated that the applicant would be entitled; but he did not believe the City was obligated to give them a contract until such time as Council approves a contract.

Mr. Knickerbocker remarked that it had been the staff's communication with the owner that they anticipated requesting such a contract, not that they believed they were entitled to one.

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council close the public hearing and direct the administration to institute annexation proceedings to annex the following:

10.25 acres of land out of the James Rodgers Survey - Mesa Park, Phase Two, Section Three. (Requested by S. A. Garza Engineers, Inc., representing Pringle Real Estate, Inc., owner.) (Case No. C7a-75-007)

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino,
Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmember Himmelblau
Noes: Mayor Friedman

COST DIFFERENCE PAYMENT

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing payment to RAYMOND E. MITCHELL for the cost difference of 12"/8" water main and appurtenances installed in Forest North Estates, Phase III, Section II, in the amount of \$8,759.14. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Lebermann, Trevino, Mayor Friedman,
Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau,
Hofmann
Noes: Councilmember Linn

CASH SETTLEMENT

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing cash settlement as follows:

BILL MILBURN, INC. - 75%/25% cash settlement in lieu of an approach main contract for installation of wastewater main extension to Beaconridge II. Total cost: \$2,109.45; City's share at 75%: \$1,582.09.

The motion, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Snell, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell,
Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann,
Noes: Councilmember Linn

DEMOLITION OF STRUCTURES

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing demolition of structures as follows:

Accept positive bids - to be moved

1. 404 Deep Eddy Avenue	E. A. Bradford	\$2,495.00
2. 401 Hearne Street	Mike Vega	\$ 400.00
3. 403 Hearne Street	Action House Movers	\$ 157.27

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Linn, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Councilmembers
Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn
Noes: Mayor Pro Tem Snell

CONTRACT AWARDED

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council adopt a resolution awarding the following contract:

- Bid Award: - Fire Department Uniforms, Central Stores Division of the Department of Purchases and Stores.
- a. Approval to issue a change order totaling \$6,854.00 to increase the quantity of certain fireman uniforms and maintain the low bid unit pricing in the original contract totaling \$41,125.00 approved by the Council on January 23, 1975. (Fechheimer Bros., Inc.)
- b. THE FECHHEIMER BROS., INC. - Items 8, 9 and 13 - \$6,854.00
4545 Malsbary Road
Cincinnati, Ohio

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Linn, carried by the following vote:

- Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell
Noes: None

CHANGE ORDER

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council adopt a resolution approving Change Order No. 1 in the amount of \$10,000.00 with Joe Syring Construction Company to provide cost sharing expenses for flood-caused damages in connection with the unusually heavy rainfalls of May 23 and June 8, 1975, during the construction of the Barton Springs Pool Floodwater Bypass, C.I.P. Project No. 8615 3. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Linn, carried by the following vote:

- Ayes: Councilmembers Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmember Himmelblau
Noes: None

ACCEPTANCE OF CONTRACT

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to accept a contract awarded to the Parks and Recreation Department by the Department of Public Welfare in the amount of \$20,053. In-kind contribution from Parks and Recreation Department will be \$8,594 with no City funds required. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

- Ayes: Councilmembers Lebermann, Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann
Noes: None

SUBMISSION OF REQUEST FOR TELETYPE SYSTEM

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to submit a request to the Texas Criminal Justice Division for the project entitled "In-House Teletype System for the Austin Police Department." Program period will be from September 1, 1975, through August 31, 1976. Total cost will be \$5,023,00, Criminal Justice Division support. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann
Noes: None

ACCEPTANCE OF CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to accept the construction agreement between the City of Austin and the State Highway Commission relative to the West 38th Street project from Jefferson Street to Avenue B and to make payment to the State in the amount of \$22,600.00. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann,
Noes: Councilmember Linn

APPROVAL OF CONTRACT FOR MEDICAL CLINIC PROJECT

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution approving a contract with the Austin-Travis County Health Department for the Rosewood Medical Clinic project in the amount of \$15,000 of Community Services Administration funds. Project period will be from May 1, 1975, through July 31, 1975. The motion, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Snell, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino
Noes: None

SUBMISSION OF CONTINUATION GRANT APPLICATION FOR
RAPE CRISIS CENTER

Mayor Pro Tem Snell moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to submit a continuation grant application to the Texas Criminal Justice Division for the project entitled "Austin Rape Crisis Center, Inc." Program period will be from October, 1975, through September 30, 1976. Total cost will be \$24,814.00, Texas Criminal Justice Division support. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Hofmann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman
Noes: None

SUBMISSION OF REQUEST FOR POLYGRAPH UNIT

Mayor Pro Tem Snell moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to submit a request to Texas Criminal Justice Division for a project entitled "Polygraph Unit for Austin Police Department." Program period will be from September 1, 1975, through December 31, 1976. Total cost will be \$59,727.90, Texas Criminal Justice Division support. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Hofmann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann,
Lebermann, Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman
Noes: None

HEARING TO CONSIDER EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY ORDINANCE

Mayor Friedman opened the public hearing scheduled for 1:30 p.m. to consider an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Ordinance, as proposed by the Human Relations Commission, FATHER JOE ZNOTAS, Chairperson of the Human Relations Commission, commented that on October 5, 1967, the Council passed an ordinance creating the Commission; and under its duties and functions, the Council charged the Commission as follows:

1. Advise and consult with the City Council on all matters involving racial, religious, or ethnic discrimination and devise practices for equal opportunity.
2. Serve in an advisory and consultative capacity to all City departments, advisory boards, and regulatory agencies to assure effective compliance with non-discrimination policies and orders, and recommend to the City Manager measures aimed at improving the ability of various departments and agencies to insure equal protection of any and all persons and groups against discrimination.

He submitted that they were trying to carry out these charges in regard to equal employment, and the purpose of the Ordinance would be to try to alleviate the heavy case load of the regional Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) in San Antonio and to continue their role to promote equal employment. In order to insure all people involved were justly treated, he noted that they had designed with the help of the City Attorney and Council a process to resolve these complaints as expediently as possible. Because of their past experience, he suggested that these complaints would not increase because of this Ordinance. He hoped that the Council would pass the ordinance, as amended today, because of the importance of equal justice for the citizens of Austin.

MS. MAXINE FRIEDMAN, member of the Commission, distributed copies of proposed amendments to the Ordinance, which had been developed by Councilmember Himmelblau and the Commission. She noted that they felt these would serve to strengthen the Ordinance and would provide for fair and equal treatment for all citizens of Austin. She took this opportunity to thank the Council and made specific mention of Councilmember Himmelblau.

She reviewed the proposed amendments:

1. Section 6.A would be amended providing that investigations of EEOC violations would be done by the Director of the Human Relations Commission or investigators on the staff of the Director.
2. Section 6.C would be amended providing the Director of the Human Relations Commission or a conciliator shall conduct conciliation agreements and settlements.
3. Section 6.E would be amended providing that the Commission upon a majority vote must refer cases for which successful conciliation had not occurred to the City Attorney for prosecution in Municipal Court or refer same to the United States EEOC.
4. Section 7.A would be amended in minor part to read the "Director or investigator shall have access to employee evidence..."
5. Section 7.D. would be amended in minor part to read: "The Commission shall have authority, upon consultation with the City Attorney, from time to time..."
6. A new Section 7.E would be added entitled and reading: "Construction. In construing this ordinance, it is the intent of the City Council that Municipal Court shall be guided by the Rules and Regulations of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and Federal Court interpretations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; and, as appropriate, the "Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967."
7. Minor language changes would be made deleting the masculine gender where it appears in Section 2.B and E. Section 3 language would be changed from "internal staff" to "employees."

Ms. Friedman recommended that the Council pass the Ordinance as amended.

Councilmember Hofmann took this opportunity to review two additional proposed amendments to the Ordinance:

1. A new Section 6.C shall be inserted providing: "Investigations shall at all times be conducted on a strictly impartial basis. The person charged shall have the opportunity to confront the person claiming to be aggrieved and the evidence upon which the person claiming to be aggrieved relies upon. The person charged shall be given ample opportunity and adequate time in which to prepare a defense to the charge and shall have the right to representation by counsel during the investigation, if desired. Upon completion of the investigation, the investigator shall prepare a determination report with specific findings of fact and conclusions."

2. A new Section 6.D shall be inserted providing: "Investigations which resulted in determinations of reasonable cause to believe discrimination occurred may be appealed by the person charged to the Human Relations Commission. Conciliation efforts shall be held in abeyance until the appeal is completed. Notice of appeal shall be given within 10 days of the receipt of the adverse determination by the person charged. The Commission shall set the appeal to be heard for the soonest practical time. The person charged who appeals shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in Section 6.C at the hearing. Upon conclusion of the hearing or as soon as practical thereafter, the Commission may by majority vote affirm, reverse or modify the determination of the investigator, as appropriate. The determination report of the Commission shall contain specific findings of fact and conclusions."

The following appeared in support of the proposed Ordinance:

MR. LOUIS BARBASH, associated with EEOC in San Antonio, pointed out the following:

1. With regard to Father Znotas' remark that the number of complaints would not increase, he submitted that whenever an office was set up to receive complaints, they increased.
2. The matter of staffing was of enormous concern. He suggested that it was possible to train an investigator to investigate 5 or 6 average cases a month; however, with EEOC's resources, they were averaging 1, 2, or 3 a month. He suggested that it was a mistake for the Council to underestimate the complexity of this.

Unless adequate staffing was provided and unless the staff were people professionally trained as investigators and conciliators, he felt that the whole procedure would "bog down"; and the result would be what was happening to the Federal EEOC.

In response to Councilmember Linn's question, he stated that basically he was in favor of the Ordinance but with some reservations.

MS. CATHY BONNER, Chairperson of the Austin Commission on the Status of Women, stated that the Commission was charged to serve as an advisory body to the Council and City Manager concerning the needs and problems of women in Austin and to recommend programs designed to alleviate any inequities that might confront women in social, economic, and vocational pursuits. Therefore, they felt it was most appropriate that they comment on this Ordinance. They contended that local enforcement of equal employment regulations was an appropriate role for the City. They also felt that a strong commitment to this concept of equal employment should be realized by ensuring that the EEOC office has adequate staffing and funding so that they could perform their function of providing fast and competent service in this area.

In response to Councilmember Linn's question, Ms. Bonner was in favor of the Ordinance but noted that the full Commission had not had a chance to review the recently proposed amendments.

MR. NORMAN EATON, member of the Human Relations Commission, stated that he was on the subcommittee that proposed the Ordinance and noted that they would negotiate with EEOC for a given number of cases; therefore, if the number of cases was to increase, their load would not increase because of the fact that they were contracting. He also submitted that it would not impair their functioning and noted that the staff would be trained by EEOC. He pointed out that the funding would depend upon the number of cases for which they contracted. He realized that the first year they did not expect to solve all the problems, but he submitted that Austin did need to get started and that this was a good start.

He commented that the Council needed to make a stand on what the Commission stood for and whether or not they had the right to gather facts and ask advice on how to prepare these in ordinance form to present to the Council for Council's determination.

In response to Mayor Pro Tem Snell's question as to what would determine the number of cases to be handled, Mr. Eaton stated that it would depend upon the funding and the number of people that could be trained in a given period of time. He noted that EEOC would not allow them to act until they had the people adequately trained.

In response to Councilmember Linn's question as to what type of priority would be involved, Mr. Eaton was not sure what the procedure would be and noted that when EEOC first began, they handled cases on a first come, first served basis without giving any priority to cases. He agreed with her comment that the overflow would be referred to San Antonio and hopefully the City's staff would grow to take heavier case loads.

City Manager Davidson asked what provision had been made for the additional personnel. Mr. Eaton commented that the Council had to pass an ordinance that Austin would stand behind the program and support it; and after that, EEOC would train the employees to staff this operation. Mr. Davidson again asked if the Commission was asking for an amendment to the budget to authorize additional personnel to carry out the functions. Mr. Eaton replied that the funding for the staff would come from the Commission's budget and federal money.

City Manager Davidson commented that the Ordinance stated that if the Council approved it today, it would constitute an emergency and would become effective immediately. He submitted that there were no investigators in the current annual operating budget. He asked what the Commission had anticipated as far as when the investigators would be available and when the program would be effective.

Mayor Friedman asked how soon the City would get the money from the federal government.

MR. JIMMY CORONADO, EEOC in Dallas, stated that it was his role to work with the State and locally to assist in developing the necessary legislature to comply with Title VII. He noted that they would begin their funding operating in October because of the change in the fiscal year. He indicated that he had been working with the Commission for some time assisting them in trying to establish an ordinance to meet the requirements of Title VII, whereby they could begin negotiation for a contract with the Commission.

In response to Mayor Friedman's question, Mr. Coronado stated that funding would not be available before October 1; and training would take place.

In response to Councilmember Himmelblau's question as to whether or not contingency funds were available, Mr. Coronado stated that there were none in that the contract was for a 12-month period.

In response to Mayor Pro Tem Snell's questions, Mr. Coronado was not in agreement with the amendments; and he stated that investigators could not be trained over any given period of time, but they would be provided with the basic tools to conduct investigations.

In response to Councilmember Linn's inquiry, Mr. Coronado did not agree with the final two amendments in that he believed they were in conflict with Title VII. In response to Mayor Pro Tem Snell's inquiry, Mr. Coronado stated that he had reviewed the first 7 amendments and had given his approval.

In reply to the City Attorney's question, Mr. Coronado pointed out that Title VII stated that none of the information gathered would be made public until such time as it came before the court.

Mr. Jan Kubicek, Assistant City Attorney, reviewed the two referenced amendments and submitted that the information would not be made available to the public at large in that it was only between the charging party and the respondent. He remarked that in some cases a charge is received, and the actual additional information that may result or develop into the investigation was not made available to the respondent.

Mr. Coronado still felt that the two amendments were in conflict with Title VII, and Councilmember Linn remarked that if the City was in conflict, the Commission would be unable to get funds.

Councilmember Himmelblau noted that she had received calls about the employer not being protected in the ordinance so that both sides would have the right to appeal.

MS. MARTHA SMILEY, Chairperson of the Austin Women's Political Caucus, commended the Commission for bringing this forward; and she submitted that her organization was only one of many who have worked for this. She addressed herself to Section 6.E which provided that if conciliation could not be reached, the Commission may refer to the Attorney or EEOC. She suggested that the language placed a burden on the Commission, and she felt that the Commission should not be required to further evaluate the merits of the case. She felt that the Commission's function appeared to be to determine whether or not there was cause to believe the charge was true. She urged the Council to amend the language to require the Commission to refer all cases in which they have found reasonable cause to either the Attorney or the federal office of EEOC.

Councilmember Linn remarked that there was an amendment to allow a person who was found in conflict with the Ordinance to appeal within 10 days to the Commission. She asked if Ms. Smiley felt the appeal should wait and be presented at the court level or made in the first case to the Commission. In response to this, Ms. Smiley felt it should be to the court rather than the Commission.

MR. CHARLES ESKRIDGE, JR., President of MIGHT, spoke in behalf of the Ordinance for all persons interested and concerned with the physically handicapped. He stated that they were not asking for a quota system or any type of percentage, but they were merely asking for the right of employment if one was qualified to do a job. He suggested that this would re-enforce the state law in effect and would bring it down to control on a community level. He felt that denial of this Ordinance would be taking away the handicapped's right to equal employment.

MR. LEO HERNANDEZ was in favor of the Ordinance and felt it should be kept under the Commission and not a department handled through the Manager. He also felt the Commission should have its own attorney instead of the City Attorney. He suggested that the Commission should be able to hire their own director.

MS. REGINA ROGOFF, Legal Aid, addressed herself to Amendment #7, as reviewed earlier by Ms. Friedman. She was not aware that the language had been changed from "internal staff" to "employees" and recommended that it be "all City employees" in that the internal staff would involve the Civil Service and would exempt all police and fire department employees, which she submitted was about 14% of the personnel staff. She felt there was no reason that would justify exempting this particular class of employees, especially since she believed they were the most overt offenders.

With regard to the amendment that would provide for a new Section 6.C and would involve a type of confrontation, she suggested that this was never intended under Title VII; and she felt there was no need for confrontation between the charging party and the employer. She noted that the opportunity for confrontation came at a later date when settlement would be impossible. She felt that this amendment would create more problems.

Ms. Rogoff was informed as to the change in language in Amendment #7 to "employees," and she stated that she was in agreement with this.

MS. JUDITH GUTHRIE, Women's Equity Action League, stated that she was a former EEOC official at the House of Representatives and that she had helped and encouraged filing of charges by women. She felt that having an information agency at the local level would provide vast improvements and would benefit both employees and employers. She noted that the League endorsed this Ordinance and urged the Council's favorable consideration of it.

MR. LONNIE BELL commended the Council and the Commission for doing such a good job on this Ordinance. He felt it was long overdue and felt that the Council should pass it.

MS. SUE LUFKIN, Travis County Democratic Women, was in support of the Ordinance as presented by the Commission due to the fact that EEOC was not doing an adequate job because of the back load. She suggested that justice delayed was justice denied; and with that in mind, they urged the Council to set up a local office in Austin as another important step to a more equitable, more humane Austin.

MS. JANNA ZUMBRUN, Austin Lesbian Organization, stated that her group represented around 200 women employed in a variety of occupations. She noted that they faced discrimination as lesbians and women and urged the Council to not lose sight of the original goal of providing equal employment opportunities on a local level.

MS. SUE REID, President of the League of Women Voters, stated that the League reaffirmed its support of the Ordinance.

MR. DONALD BELL was very much in favor of the Ordinance, but he was concerned about the amount of time involved between the filing of a complaint and the actual resolution.

In response to Mr. Bell's comment, Ms. Friedman stated that the period of time was 180 days; and having an ordinance would not increase the amount of time to wait. In response to Mr. Bell's remark that in some instances it had been as long as 2 years and his suggestion that it should be stated that action would be taken, Ms. Friedman indicated that there was no way to feasibly do this.

The following appeared in opposition to the proposed Ordinance:

MR. HECTOR DELEON, member of the Human Relations Commission, stated that every member of the Commission had an obligation and commitment to human rights, including but not limited to equal opportunity employment. He suggested that if equal employment opportunity were the issue before the Council, he was convinced the Commission would be before the Council as a strong, unified voice demanding affirmative action. However, he suggested that what was before the Council was a specific ordinance as "the way to deal with employment discrimination in Austin."

He felt that when the Commission came before the Council with a recommendation in the form of a draft, it should be a model one that was free of possible defects. Therefore, he stated that he felt compelled to deliver a minority report by members of the Commission in respect to the proposed Ordinance. He listed those members as follows:

Ammon Wroe
Suzon Kemp

Sam Winters
Hector DeLeon

He addressed himself to the following:

1. Their initial obligation centered on cost. He realized that cost should have no bearing on a commitment to equal employment opportunity; but before any proposal was enacted, he felt the Council should have some idea of potential cost to the City, if any.
2. Related to cost would be the extent of coverage of the Ordinance, such as how many businesses would be effected and how many employees would be covered. With this information in mind, he suggested that a projection could be made with regard to the number of complaints could be anticipated in the first year.

3. He submitted that it was an accepted principle of law that before recourse could be had to the courts, any administrative remedies available must be exhausted. He felt that if the Council adopted this ordinance, it would allow the Commission to be involved before grievance procedures were exhausted. He felt the City should allow individuals an opportunity to implement sound management and personnel procedures, and this would act as a deterrent to that principle.
4. He suggested that the Ordinance would impose broad judicial responsibilities on the Commission, and he questioned whether they were trained and equipped to act in that capacity and do justice to their other responsibilities.
5. With regard to sexual orientation, he stated that the Council could as a policy matter include this in the Ordinance. However, there was some question in his mind that justification could be found for the inclusion of this wording in the equal employment opportunity area. He commented that he was not aware of any complaints to EEOC of this sort of nature.
6. He felt that this Ordinance was an extension of EEOC authority by contract and was, therefore, redundant.
7. With regard to including City employees, he noted that there were some legal questions; and this would pre-empt existing statutes.
8. Many larger employers were beyond the corporate limits and, therefore, beyond jurisdiction of City government.

It was his hope that the Council would not act finally today but would attempt to reform this Ordinance so that it would effectively deal with the dilemma of providing true equal employment opportunity. He envisioned an agency equipped to answer questions and present profitable input on the issue of equal employment opportunity. It was his belief that this Ordinance as currently structured was merely an "empty promise of justice, replete with symbolism, but devoid of substance."

Mayor Friedman asked Mr. DeLeon if he felt more comfortable with the amendments to the Ordinance so that there would be professional staff hired and trained to do this work without the Commission sitting in judicial form. In response to this, Mr. DeLeon still hoped the Council would engage in further study and attempt to implement the true purposes of equal employment opportunity.

Councilmember Lebermann asked if Mr. DeLeon felt the Ordinance in present form with amendments would be better and more professionally implemented through the vehicle recommended by Mayor Pro Tem Snell two weeks ago, whereby there would be the creation of an EEO Department. In response to this, Mr. DeLeon felt this might be a possibility but suggested that all alternatives should be examined carefully.

In response to Councilmember Linn's question, Mr. DeLeon stated that he was not familiar with the Supreme Court's decision with regard to sexual orientation and federal employees.

MR. BOB LUSK, 1415 Fairwood, submitted that the citizens had never delegated to the Council the power to adopt this ordinance; but he submitted they had every right to require equal employment opportunity within the City government, by the utility companies in franchise with the City, or any businesses who sell goods and services to the City. He felt that the Council did not have the constitutional authority to apply this to individual businesses and felt that it was contrary to Federal Court's ruling. He appealed to the Council to strike from this proposal every application with regard to individual organizations who get in no way tax monies from the City of Austin.

MR. RODNEY GRIFFIN was in opposition to this particular Ordinance but not because he did not support equal employment but because he felt it did not really have the "teeth" an ordinance should have. He suggested something similar to Mayor Pro Tem Snell's proposal for a department that would handle professionally complaints as laid out in the Ordinance. He felt that this department should be responsible to the City Manager, and in this way the Council could have a more effective hand in seeing that equal employment opportunities were carried out.

MR. HARRY BENGSTON was not for or against the Ordinance but had some reservations to which he addressed himself:

1. Duplication of effort in view of the fact that federal law was set up to handle such situations.
2. Cost involved.
3. He felt over 50% of the employers would be exempt from this.
4. He felt the employer should be allowed to appeal the decision.
5. He felt the employer should have the right to question the complainant before the issue comes to court.

He suggested that all the amendments be worked into the Ordinance and suggested that the Council not act without giving this a little more study.

Motion

Mayor Friedman introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE DECLARING THE POLICY OF THE CITY TO BE IN FURTHERANCE OF THE RIGHT OF EACH INDIVIDUAL TO OBTAIN EMPLOYMENT WITHOUT REGARD TO RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, NATIONAL ORIGIN, AGE, OR PHYSICAL HANDICAP; DEFINING TERMS; PROHIBITING CERTAIN UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES; PROVIDING CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS; ESTABLISHING A PROCEDURE FOR THE HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS; PROVIDING FOR REFERRAL OF CASES TO THE CITY ATTORNEY; FORBIDDING INTIMIDATION; PROVIDING FOR RULE MAKING AUTHORITY OF THE COMMISSION; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING PENALTIES; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Councilmember Linn moved that the public hearing be closed and the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately (with Amendments 1 through 7 as proposed by Councilmember Himmelblau and the Human Relations Commission, including specifically the amendments to Section 7.D, "consultation with the City Attorney," and Section 3, "internal staff" to "employees," so that it would be unlawful for an employer of 15 or more persons, a labor union, employment agency, and the City to discriminate in hiring on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, age, or physical handicap.) Councilmember Trevino seconded the motion.

Substitute Motion

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the public hearing be closed and the Council pass the Equal Employment Opportunity Ordinance with Amendments 1 through 7 and the two additional amendments to provide for a new Section 6.C and Section 6.D and that administration be given to a separate department in accordance with Mayor Pro Tem Snell's recommendation, with funding to be handled in the October budget. Mayor Pro Tem Snell seconded the substitute motion.

Roll Call on Substitute Motion

Roll call on Councilmember Lebermann's substitute motion, Mayor Pro Tem Snell's second, showed the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Snell
Noes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Linn, Trevino,
Mayor Friedman

The substitute motion failed to carry by a 2 to 5 vote.

Offer of Amendment to Motion

Councilmember Lebermann offered an amendment to Councilmember Linn's motion, whereby it would include the new Section 6.C and Section 6.D. However, Councilmember Linn did not accept the amendment.

Substitute Motion

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the hearing be closed and the Council pass the Equal Employment Opportunity Ordinance with Amendments 1 through 7 and the two additional amendments to provide for a new Section 6.C and Section 6.D. Councilmember Lebermann seconded the substitute motion. Roll call showed the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Lebermann
Noes: Councilmembers Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro
Tem Snell, Councilmember Hofmann

The substitute motion failed to carry by a 2 to 5 vote.

Mayor Pro Tem Snell took this opportunity to state that he had objected to the original proposal because of the fact that cases were still pending. He commented that he would continue to vote with the proposal he had made because he had made it; but with all the work that had gone on since the time he had made his counter proposal, he felt the amendments were something he could live with. He felt that they had helped to make the Ordinance under the division as proposed something he probably could live with. Hesitantly, he stated he would speak in favor of the proposal as proposed by the people who had worked so hard. He added that all during the time he worked with this, he had only one thing in mind, and that was results. He hoped the day would come when the City could see better employment in the City government and the City's private industry. He hoped the City could eliminate using the Council as a sounding board for people who were afraid to speak up because of things that had happened to them. He submitted that if this passed, he would be watching very closely; and within 6 or 7 months or a year, he would offer another counter proposal if this was not working.

Vote on Motion

The vote on Councilmember Linn's original motion, Councilmember Trevino's second, to close the public hearing and pass the Equal Employment Opportunity Ordinance with Amendments 1 through 7, was as follows:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn,
Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell

Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Friedman pointed out that the Ordinance would go into effect, but funding would not be available until around October 1; the staff would not be hired; and work could not commence. He noted that the City would now be entering the phase where we would be negotiating with the federal government to get those funds available.

Mr. Norman Eaton, member of the Commission, was very proud that the Council had given them the vote of confidence they needed and thanked the Council for passage of the ordinance.

HEARING ON PROPOSED VACATION OF STREETS

Mayor Friedman opened the public hearing on the proposed vacation of the following streets and the passage of the ordinance:

Portions of NORTHCROSS DRIVE, FOSTER LANE, and ROCKWOOD LANE in the subdivision known as Northcross, Section Two. (Requested by Scudder, Wadsworth and Carson, Architects and Planners representing Northcross Associates, Ltd., and Samuel E. Dunnam, owners.)

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker, Assistant Director of Planning, reviewed this by stating that it was a request to vacate an existing improved street within the Northcross Mall in favor of a new dedication for eventual expansion of the Mall.

He stated that on December 17, 1971, Northcross, Section Two, was recorded on the subject site which dedicated Northcross Drive. On March 21, 1975, William Carson, representing Northcross, requested that in conjunction with the proposed resubdivision of the property, which would relocate the street, portions of the street would be vacated. He pointed out that property owners in the area expressed concern as to how the relocation would adversely effect their properties. He added that the Engineering Department had questions concerning the effect this proposal would have on surface drainage and proposed water retention ponds in connection with the subdivision.

He continued by stating that on April 4, 1975, Mr. Carson requested a postponement to allow time for his client and those with questions to resolve the differences on what these effects might be. He noted that the request to proceed with the vacation and resubdivision was received on April 23, 1975; and the Planning Commission hearing was held on June 24, at which time they heard from the public, the applicant, and staff relating to traffic intensity and traffic control devices on Anderson Lane to better control existing and contemplated vehicle flow. He noted that the Commission approved the proposed resubdivision subject to compliance with all departmental requirements and subject to approval of the Council to vacate these streets in favor of the new alignment, which was part of the subdivision. He commented that there had been a meeting since that time between the applicant and those in opposition to the vacation of the street and felt that the applicant would express some of the agreements and understandings that had been reached as a result of that meeting.

In response to Councilmember Himmelblau's question, Mr. Knickerbocker stated that the developer proposed to reconstruct the new street at its new location in conjunction with the resubdivision of the property.

In reply to Councilmember Linn's question, Mr. Knickerbocker noted that there were no other streets on the other side of Anderson Lane; but there was a main entrance to the Village Shopping Center and 14 driveways between the relocated Northcross Drive and Burnet Road.

In connection with Councilmember Himmelblau's inquiry concerning whether or not the City incurred any expense on the original Northcross Drive, Mr. Knickerbocker did not have the answer.

MR. WILL GARWOOD, representing the applicant, pointed out that actually what was before the Council was an application to vacate a portion of Northcross Drive, Foster Lane, and Rockwood Lane and would involve a new land plan for the entire 80-acre site of the subdivision. He emphasized that the staff did recommend this vacation and recommended the subdivision which was proposed with it, and the Planning Commission not only recommended the subdivision but recommended the street vacation. He noted that the members of the Allandale Neighborhood Association who had studied this were present to give their support for the vacation and the land use plan of which it was a key element. He pointed out that the plan was developed by the owner, Mr. Dunnam, with the advice and assistance of experts in the fields of land use planning, hydrology, and traffic.

Mr. Garwood indicated that the thrust of this plan for the 80 acres was an improved land use plan that would have advantages not otherwise available for drainage control, traffic improvement, and buffering of the site from the

residential neighborhood adjoining the site. He noted that his clients agreed to cooperate with the other property owners along Anderson Lane, including the Village, with regard to traffic and had urged the City to construct medians along Anderson Lane, as was recommended by Urban Transportation, and to have median breaks at places where deemed to be advisable and of the best advantage to the Village.

MR. BILL SCUDDER, representing the applicant, reviewed the existing land use plan of the Northcross area by use of charts and addressed himself to some of the problems that existed:

1. Adjoined by existing single-family neighborhoods on south and west.

He noted that the only protection the neighborhoods had was the narrow buffers that existed and pointed out that backs of retail establishments were not good neighbors to single family areas. He submitted that moving the street over and building a large landscape berm for sound abatement and visual removal of the street from the neighborhood would be the best possible relationship. He indicated that this had been reviewed with the Association.

He noted that there was a small area that was impossible to bring the street adjacent to because of radii problems, and he stated that this land was now zoned "GR" General Retail District. He propped that this land be limited to those uses in "O" Office District and proposed performance standards dealing with graphics, landscaping density, etc. He stated that they had visited with the residents of this, and to his knowledge they were satisfied with this.

2. Discharge into the Shoal Creek Watershed.

He indicated that the criteria their hydrologist used was to take the discharge of the total Northcross site in its natural state and limit their discharge during peak flooding times into the Creek to no more than that. He pointed out that this would entail widening the channel to enlarge the capacity. He indicated that the main feature of their water abatement plan was that contours of the land ran to a natural low point in the area.

3. Developing traffic problems on Anderson Lane.

He stated that one main purpose of Northcross Drive was to act as a diversion for northbound traffic on Burnet Road that needed to left turn on Anderson Lane. With proper synchronization and a minimum of curb cuts on the south side, he suggested that this problem would be kept to a minimum.

Mr. Garwood pointed out that the developer would pay for the street relocation and added that North Austin State Bank did not object to this relocation. He stated that they had informed them that during the reconstruction

of Northcross they would see that they leave at least one north lane and at least one south lane operative, except for Sundays.

In response to the question as to whether or not any City expenses had been incurred at the beginning when the area was first laid out, City Manager Davidson stated that the City participated in paving refund of \$9,888.80 in connection with initial development.

The City Attorney asked about what type of assurance the City could work out so that the conditions as recommended by the staff would be met. It was Mr. Garwood's understanding that they would be going back to the Planning Commission, and Mr. Knickerbocker reported that the subdivision would not be approved until all conditions had been met.

The City Attorney suggested that possibly the Council could approve this today and instruct the staff to bring the ordinance back to be passed once conditions had been met; otherwise, the street would be vacated, and it would be out from under the City's control.

Mr. Garwood did not mind the restriction and was only concerned about the finality so that they would not have to come back again. He noted that Mr. Charles Graves, Director of Engineering, appeared before the Planning Commission and spoke very highly of the drainage and water retention system this plan had demonstrated.

MR. BERNARD SNYDER, Chairperson of the Merchants Association at Northcross Mall, stated that they supported the new plan because they felt if the additional development took place, it would be to the advantage of Northcross and the Village and other merchants of this area. They supported the developer in order to improve merchandising of the area and establishing a new road to do this without any problem.

MR. TERRY LEIFESTE, Allandale Neighborhood Association, felt that the applicant had come up with a reasonable way to develop the land. He recommended the plan for the resubdivision because it would decrease flooding and provide a pleasant visual buffer to the people adjacent to the area.

MR. WILBURN JONES, one of the owners of the Village, opposed the vacation for the reason that when they bought the tract of land and developed the Village, they designed the driveways to correspond with Northcross Drive. He felt that moving the street would have an adverse effect on the Village and create additional traffic problems. He felt that if the driveway remained as it was, signals could be placed at this point to relieve some of the traffic hazards. He submitted that he was not opposed to the vacation but rather the traffic problem on Anderson, which they felt needed to be resolved and had formulated efforts and input in an attempt to do so.

Mayor Friedman submitted that whether the Council approved this or not did not speak to the need or qualification of an area for stop lights and medians. He suggested that as qualifications were met and a need was shown, the City would proceed with proper placement of traffic control devices.

Mr. Garwood suggested that if the Council approved this, they do so not only in principle but by passing the ordinance but making it ineffective until the subdivision was recorded.

City Attorney Butler understood Mr. Garwood's problem and recommended that if an ordinance was needed, the Council go and pass one.

Mayor Friedman remarked that as long as Mr. Knickerbocker was convinced that the subdivision could not be approved until conditions were met, he saw no problem.

Mayor Friedman introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE VACATING AND PERPETUALLY CLOSING THOSE CERTAIN PORTIONS OF NORTH CROSS DRIVE, FOSTER LANE AND ROCKWOOD LANE, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; RETAINING AN EASEMENT IN THE CITY FOR PUBLIC UTILITIES AND DRAINAGE PURPOSES; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF AN ORDINANCE ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council close the public hearing, waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Hofmann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro
Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Friedman suggested that Mr. Jones continue his dialogue with Urban Transportation in regard to the traffic.

ITEM CONCERNING EMINENT DOMAIN PROCEEDINGS

The Council had before it consideration of eminent domain proceedings to acquire the following property for the Municipal Annex:

1. Lots 5 and 6, Block 2, Original City of Austin (401-407 West 2nd Street) - F. Ralph Schneider, owner.
2. Lots 1, 2, and 3, Block 21, Original City of Austin (203 Guadalupe) - Charles J. Schneider, Jr., owner.

Col. C. N. Avery, Jr., representing Mr. Charles Schneider, submitted that this property had been in Mr. Schneider's family's control for over 100 years and desired very much to retain its possession. He stated that there had been very limited efforts to negotiate any settlement or any type of plan by which this property could be purchased by the City. However, he indicated that if the resolution was passed, Mr. Schneider would be willing to discuss final disposition of the property.

Mr. Ralph Schneider reiterated that this property had been in the family for over 100 years, and they wanted to keep it. He noted that he had received one letter from the City to which he never replied because he thought it was ridiculous. He asked if there were anything that could be done to retain possession of the property.

In response to Councilmember Linn's question, Mr. Ralph Schneider stated that he would especially like to keep the store and reiterated that he had had no contact from the City except the letter. City Attorney Butler pointed out that Mr. Don Wolf, Assistant City Attorney, had been in contact with Mr. Schneider's attorney and was waiting for an appraisal.

Councilmember Linn suggested that this be postponed until the staff had time to be in contact and negotiate with the property owner.

Councilmember Lebermann felt that a delay would be in order but mentioned that this was critical to future municipal needs and needed to be expedited.

There was discussion by Councilmembers Linn and Lebermann with regard to the period of time this should be postponed, and Mayor Friedman suggested 3 weeks would give enough time for all the appraisals to come in.

Councilmember Linn pointed out that the store had a State historical marker on it and felt that the City should be very careful with the way this building was handled.

Councilmember Linn moved that the Council postpone consideration of eminent domain proceedings on the afore-mentioned property until July 31, 1975. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers
Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino

Noes: None

ITEM CONCERNING PURCHASE OF LAND FOR MOPAC

The Council had before it for possible authorization the purchase of vacant land for the MoPac right of way as follows:

402 square feet of land out of Lot 19, Block A, Balcones
Terrace (C. L. Reeves)

Mayor Friedman pointed out that MoPac was under study and hopefully something would be determined in a couple of weeks. He wondered if the Council might postpone any acquisition of land for MoPac until they had made a decision.

City Manager Davidson indicated that Councilmember Hofmann had asked that the staff prepare a report with regard to what the City was committed to acquire as opposed to future acquisitions not yet contracted for. He had no problem in holding up until the material was presented to the Council.

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council postpone this acquisition for MoPac pending the report from Property Management. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Linn, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann,
Lebermann, Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman

Noes: None

PURCHASE OF LAND FOR WEBBERVILLE ROAD

Councilmember Hofmann moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the purchase of 2501 Francisco Street (Elaine Doherty Leach et vir, Lawrence V. Leach) for Webberville Road Bridge and Street improvements. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn,
Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell
Noes: None

AMENDMENT TO CONTRACT FOR PHYSICIANS' SERVICES

Councilmember Linn moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing approval of an amendment to the contract between the City of Austin and Central Texas Medical Foundation for Professional Physicians' Services at Brackenridge Hospital Emergency Room. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Hofmann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino,
Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmember Himmelblau
Noes: None

HEARING SET TO AMEND FIRE CODE

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council set a public hearing for 1:00 p.m. on July 31, 1975, to amend the Austin Fire Code pertaining to Blasting Regulations. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Linn, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Lebermann, Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman,
Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann
Noes: None

CLARIFICATION OF POLICY FOR STREET AND ALLEY VACATIONS

The Council had before it a resolution clarifying the policy which established charges for street and alley vacations, which had been adopted on June 19, 1975. Councilmember Linn moved that the Council adopt a resolution clarifying the policy so that it shall be "applicable to all street and alley vacations authorized by action of the City Council after the date of such Resolution (June 19), and specifically, shall be applicable to all street and/or alley vacations for which applications were then pending or had been filed." The motion, seconded by Mayor Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro
Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann
Noes: Councilmember Lebermann

APPEARANCE CONCERNING PENSION REQUEST

Chief Tom Pinckney, representing Fire Fighters' Pension Board, appeared before the Council to present the fire fighters' pension request. He stated that they contributed 11.85% to the fund, and the City matched this. He indicated that they were requesting that the City contribute an additional 6% into the fund; and he submitted that according to State law, this would be legal in that it stated that the governing body of the city might authorize the city to make an additional contribution to its firemen's relief and retirement fund in whatever amount the governing body of the city might fix. He pointed out that the Charter stated that the City's contribution shall be equal to the contributions of the employees.

He noted that when they had discussed this proposal with the City Manager, they had requested the 6% in the upcoming budget, which would entail \$234,000. However, they had amended their request so that on October 1, 1975, the City would contribute a 2% increase which would amount to \$78,000; on October 1, 1976, an additional 2% for \$156,000; and on October 1, 1977, an additional 2% for \$234,000.

He presented the Council with figures with regard to what other fire fighters in Texas were paying and what some of these cities were contributing.

He asked that this be worked out with the City Manager in the next couple of months and requested that they have an answer before October 1. He stated that they would be grateful if something could be worked out.

City Manager Davidson addressed himself to the difference in the amounts contributed by other cities and the contribution of Austin. He indicated that at the time the Council would be considering this request with the Board's assistance, the staff would develop some information so that the Council could see the equivalent percentage amounts contributed by each of the cities that had been mentioned.

Councilmember Linn requested that the Council be provided with the information that the Chief had presented so that this could be studied.

In his presentation Chief Pinckney had noted that they were not covered by Social Security and did not wish to be. With regard to this, Mayor Pro Tem Snell asked why he had made this remark. Chief Pinckney indicated that their objection was that they would be required to work until they were 65 years of age, and this was the type of work that was strenuous.

Mayor Pro Tem Snell requested a comparison of what Social Security benefits could be if the firemen were covered in relation to what they were receiving now.

REQUEST FOR USE OF TOWN LAKE

The Council had before it a request by Glastron Boat Company and Bill Gaston, Inc., to use Town Lake between the Congress Avenue and Interregional Highway bridges for their Annual Boating Demonstration to be held from July 28 through August 1, 1975. In response to questions, a representative of Glastron stated that the boats would only be in use on July 28 and 31 and that this was for a presentation of their 1976 model line to their distributors from all over

the United States. He stated that they were proposing to use only five boats for demonstration purposes; and they would be stored at Fiesta Gardens, and they would provide guards.

Councilmember Lebermann pointed out that they had been doing this for years, and there had never been any suggestion of any public disturbance at all.

Councilmember Hofmann asked that Glastron consider in future years thinking of using other lakes where there were not any restrictions. In response to this, he stated that they would be happy to work with whatever they could. Councilmember Hofmann submitted that there were more and more requests for use of Town Lake with no revenue to benefit the City for this. She suggested that they think of diminishing this.

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council approve the request by Glastron Boat Company and Bill Gaston, Inc., for use of Town Lake between the Congress Avenue and Interregional Highway bridges for their Annual Boating Demonstration to be held from July 28 through August 1, 1975. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember Trevino, Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann

Noes: Councilmember Linn

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Mayor Friedman

REQUEST TO HANG BANNER

Councilmember Linn moved that the Council approve a request by Hilton Sherrod, Elder of Southwest Church of Christ, for permission to hang a banner across Manchaca Road at the intersection of Jones Road from July 28 through August 8, 1975, to advertise Vacation Bible School. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino

Noes: None

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Mayor Friedman

HEARING SET IN CONNECTION WITH PAVING ASSESSMENTS

Mayor Friedman introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE WRITTEN STATEMENT AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SHOWING THE ESTIMATES OF THE TOTAL COSTS OF ALL THE IMPROVEMENTS, THE ESTIMATES OF THE COSTS PER FRONT FOOT PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF, AND THE ESTIMATES OF VARIOUS OTHER COSTS FOR THE IMPROVING OF PORTIONS OF SUNDRY STREETS IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, WITHIN THE LIMITS HEREINBELOW DESCRIBED, AND OTHER MATTERS RELATING THERETO; DETERMINING AND FIXING THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS AND THE RATE THEREOF PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST AND PAID BY THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF; DETERMINING THE NECESSITY OF LEVYING AN ASSESSMENT AGAINST SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS

THEREOF FOR THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS APPORTIONED TO THEM; ORDERING AND SETTING A HEARING AT 11:00 O'CLOCK A.M. ON THE 14TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1975, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN MUNICIPAL ANNEX, AS THE TIME AND PLACE FOR THE HEARING OF THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS OF SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY AND ALL OTHERS INTERESTED IN SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY OR IN ANY OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND CONTRACT CONCERNING SAID ASSESSMENTS, PROCEEDINGS AND IMPROVEMENTS; DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, TO GIVE NOTICE OF SAID HEARING AS REQUIRED BY THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF TEXAS AND THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN; DECLARING AND PROVIDING THAT THIS ORDINANCE SHALL TAKE EFFECT IMMEDIATELY UPON ITS PASSAGE. (Alamo Street and sundry other streets, Contract No. 74-Pa-133)

Councilmember Hofmann moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino

Noes: None

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Mayor Friedman

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Friedman introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE WRITTEN STATEMENT AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SHOWING THE ESTIMATES OF THE TOTAL COSTS OF ALL THE IMPROVEMENTS, THE ESTIMATES OF THE COSTS PER FRONT FOOT PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF, AND THE ESTIMATES OF VARIOUS OTHER COSTS FOR THE IMPROVING OF PORTIONS OF SUNDRY STREETS IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, WITHIN THE LIMITS HEREINBELOW DESCRIBED, AND OF OTHER MATTERS RELATING THERETO; DETERMINING AND FIXING THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS AND THE RATE THEREOF PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST AND PAID BY THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF; DETERMINING THE NECESSITY OF LEVYING AN ASSESSMENT AGAINST SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF FOR THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS APPORTIONED TO THEM; ORDERING AND SETTING A HEARING AT 11:00 O'CLOCK A. M. ON THE 14TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1975, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN MUNICIPAL ANNEX, AS THE TIME AND PLACE FOR THE HEARING OF THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS OF SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY AND ALL OTHERS INTERESTED IN SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY OR IN ANY OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND CONTRACT CONCERNING SAID ASSESSMENTS, PROCEEDINGS AND IMPROVEMENTS; DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, TO GIVE NOTICE OF SAID HEARING AS REQUIRED BY THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF TEXAS AND THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN; DECLARING AND PROVIDING THAT THIS ORDINANCE SHALL TAKE EFFECT IMMEDIATELY UPON ITS PASSAGE. (Alexander Avenue and other streets)

Councilmember Hofmann moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino

Noes: None

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Mayor Friedman

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Friedman introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE WRITTEN STATEMENT AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SHOWING THE ESTIMATES OF THE TOTAL COSTS OF ALL THE IMPROVEMENTS, THE ESTIMATES OF THE COSTS PER FRONT FOOT PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF, AND THE ESTIMATES OF VARIOUS OTHER COSTS FOR THE IMPROVING OF PORTIONS OF SUNDRY STREETS IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, WITHIN THE LIMITS HEREINBELOW DESCRIBED, AND OF OTHER MATTERS RELATING THERETO; DETERMINING AND FIXING THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS AND THE RATE THEREOF PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST AND PAID BY THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF; DETERMINING THE NECESSITY OF LEVYING AN ASSESSMENT AGAINST SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF FOR THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS APPORTIONED TO THEM; ORDERING AND SETTING A HEARING AT 11:00 O'CLOCK A.M. ON THE 14TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1975, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN MUNICIPAL ANNEX, AS THE TIME AND PLACE FOR THE HEARING OF THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS OF SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY AND ALL OTHERS INTERESTED IN SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY OR IN ANY OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND CONTRACT CONCERNING SAID ASSESSMENTS, PROCEEDINGS AND IMPROVEMENTS; DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, TO GIVE NOTICE OF SAID HEARING AS REQUIRED BY THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF TEXAS AND THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN; DECLARING AND PROVIDING THAT THIS ORDINANCE SHALL TAKE EFFECT IMMEDIATELY UPON ITS PASSAGE. (Springdale Road and sundry other streets, Contract No. 74-Pa-135)

Councilmember Hofmann moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino

Noes: None

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Mayor Friedman

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Friedman introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE WRITTEN STATEMENT AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SHOWING THE ESTIMATES OF THE TOTAL COSTS OF ALL THE IMPROVEMENTS, THE ESTIMATES OF THE COSTS PER FRONT FOOT PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF, AND THE ESTIMATES OF VARIOUS OTHER COSTS FOR THE IMPROVING OF PORTIONS OF SUNDRY STREETS IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, WITHIN THE

LIMITS HEREINBELOW DESCRIBED, AND OF OTHER MATTERS RELATING THERETO; DETERMINING AND FIXING THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS AND THE RATE THEREOF PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST AND PAID BY THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF; DETERMINING THE NECESSITY OF LEVYING AN ASSESSMENT AGAINST SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF FOR THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS APPORTIONED TO THEM; ORDERING AND SETTING A HEARING AT 11:00 O'CLOCK A.M. ON THE 14TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1975, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN MUNICIPAL ANNEX, AS THE TIME AND PLACE FOR THE HEARING OF THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS OF SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY AND ALL OTHERS INTERESTED IN SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY OR IN ANY OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND CONTRACT CONCERNING SAID ASSESSMENTS, PROCEEDINGS AND IMPROVEMENTS; DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, TO GIVE NOTICE OF SAID HEARING AS REQUIRED BY THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF TEXAS AND THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN; DECLARING AND PROVIDING THAT THIS ORDINANCE SHALL TAKE EFFECT IMMEDIATELY UPON ITS PASSAGE. (Springdale Road, Contract No. 74-Pa-119)

Councilmember Hofmann moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino

Noes: None

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Mayor Friedman

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Friedman introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE WRITTEN STATEMENT AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SHOWING THE ESTIMATES OF THE TOTAL COSTS OF ALL THE IMPROVEMENTS, THE ESTIMATES OF THE COSTS PER FRONT FOOT PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF, AND THE ESTIMATES OF VARIOUS OTHER COSTS FOR THE IMPROVING OF PORTIONS OF SUNDRY STREETS IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, WITHIN THE LIMITS HEREINBELOW DESCRIBED, AND OF OTHER MATTERS RELATING THERETO; DETERMINING AND FIXING THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS AND THE RATE THEREOF PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST AND PAID BY THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF; DETERMINING THE NECESSITY OF LEVYING AN ASSESSMENT AGAINST SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF FOR THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS APPORTIONED TO THEM; ORDERING AND SETTING A HEARING AT 11:00 O'CLOCK A.M. ON THE 14TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1975, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN MUNICIPAL ANNEX, AS THE TIME AND PLACE FOR THE HEARING OF THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS OF SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY AND ALL OTHERS INTERESTED IN SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY OR IN ANY OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND CONTRACT CONCERNING SAID ASSESSMENTS, PROCEEDINGS AND IMPROVEMENTS; DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, TO GIVE NOTICE OF SAID HEARING AS REQUIRED BY THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF TEXAS AND THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN; DECLARING AND PROVIDING THAT THIS ORDINANCE SHALL TAKE EFFECT IMMEDIATELY UPON ITS PASSAGE. (Rundberg Lane, Contract No. 74-Pa-134)

Councilmember Hofmann moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino

Noes: None

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Mayor Friedman

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Councilmember Linn commented that in some of these neighborhoods there were a number of elderly people on Social Security who could not afford these assessments and submitted that it was a source of loss of pride for them. She asked if there was any way the City could correct this policy for people on Social Security.

The City Manager noted that he had distributed a report explaining the City's current assessment policy on street paving. He pointed out that prior to August 14, he would submit additional information to the Council before a decision was reached; and he would answer many questions like this. He submitted that it was very difficult for a city to afford paving unless it was assessed. He indicated that he would address the options available with regard to not being able to pay.

Councilmember Linn submitted that even though the City was very lenient, it caused a great deal of worry on the part of the elderly.

Mr. Davidson noted that he would explain in the report the inequities the City would get into and the problems if we tried to exempt some from assessment.

City Attorney Butler pointed out that no paving assessment could be more than the actual enhancement to the property and suggested that the City might want to make it very clear that there would be no taking of their property.

Mr. Davidson also noted that part of the report would make new recommendations as to how to correct inequities.

There was discussion with regard to the Handcox Plan, and the City Manager stated that it came about because there were renters who had no control over whether or not streets would be paved, and a petition was required from the owners. Under the Handcox Plan, the City would pave streets without petitions and requests from the owners.

AMENDMENT TO COUNCIL MEETING TIMES

Mayor Friedman introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING MEETING TIMES FOR THE REGULAR WEEKLY MEETING OF THE AUSTIN CITY COUNCIL AND SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS. (To meet at 10:00 a.m., with every third Thursday to begin at 7:00 p.m.)

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Hofmann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Trevino,
Mayor Pro Tem Snell

Noes: Councilmember Linn

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Mayor Friedman

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

APPROACH MAIN CONTRACT

Mayor Friedman introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER OR DEPUTY CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A CERTAIN REFUND CONTRACT WITH JAGGER ASSOCIATES, INCORPORATED. (Wind Ridge Apartments)

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Hofmann, Lebermann, Trevino, Mayor Pro Tem
Snell, Councilmember Himmelblau

Noes: Councilmember Linn

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Mayor Friedman

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

TRANSPORTATION SAFETY OFFICE

The Council had before it a report concerning a City/County Transportation Safety Office. The City Manager stated that basically the staff wanted to make certain they were proceeding along the lines the Council would like for a joint Office as opposed to two separate offices. He stated that at the appropriate time they could come back with contracts, etc.

Councilmember Trevino moved that the Council approve the concept and authorize the staff to proceed. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Lebermann, Linn, Trevino, Mayor Pro Tem
Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann

Noes: None

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Mayor Friedman

HAIR TRIM REQUIREMENTS

Councilmember Linn moved that the Council instruct the City Manager to set up a committee to review current grooming standards at the Fire Department and recommend changes in line with modern social standards and customs but with regard to safety requirements, with this study to begin immediately and recommendations to be made to the Civil Service Commission within 45 days. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Linn, Trevino, Mayor Pro Tem Snell,
Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann
Noes: None
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Mayor Friedman

ESTABLISHMENT OF TERMS OF OFFICE

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council establish two-year terms of office for the members of the following:

1. Elizabeth Ney Museum Board of Directors
2. Energy Study Committee

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember Trevino, Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers
Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn
Noes: None
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Mayor Friedman

With regard to the Signs and Billboards Study Committee, it was pointed out that it was an Ad Hoc Committee that would "self-destruct" upon completion of their final report. In response to questions, it could not be determined when the report would be completed. Councilmember Linn requested that the Council be furnished with the date at their Executive Session.

PUBLIC NOTICE ON SPECIAL PERMIT APPEALS

Councilmember Himmelblau requested that there be public notice on special permit appeals to the City Council, but the City Attorney noted that this would be an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and required the Planning Commission's recommendation.

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council refer this to the Planning Commission as an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers
Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino
Noes: None

HEARING SET ON AMENDMENTS TO WRECKER ORDINANCE

Councilmember Lebermann moved that the Council set a public hearing for 1:00 p.m. on July 31, 1975, on amendments to the Wrecker Ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro-Tem Snell, Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Lebermann, Linn, Trevino, Mayor Friedman
 Noes: None

ZONINGS SET FOR PUBLIC HEARING

The City Manager reported that the following zoning applications had been referred to the Planning Commission for recommendation and had been set for public hearing on August 7, 1975:

SHIRLEY S. SLAUGHTER By Malcolm Robinson C14-75-068	1608 West 34th Street, also bounded by Jeff- erson Street and Glenview Avenue	From "A" Residence To "GR" General Retail
LONE STAR COMPANY By Frank E. Jones C14-75-070	8990 Research Boulevard	From Interim "A" Residence 1st Height and Area To "DL" Light Industrial 1st Height and Area
COLD, INC. By Eugene O. Jarman C14-75-071	704-706 West Powell Lane	From Interim "A" Residence 1st Height and Area and "D" Industrial 1st Height and Area To "D" Industrial 1st Height and Area
OTTO HOFMANN C14-75-072	610 Cardinal Lane	From Interim "A" Residence 1st Height and Area To "GR" General Retail 1st Height and Area
JOSEPH E. SEGOVIA By Philip Spies C14-75-073	2100 Garden Street also bounded by Anthony Street	From "A" Residence To "C" Commercial
CHESTER HUNT C14-75-074	9611 McNeil Road also bounded by Saunders Lane	From "D" Industrial To "E" Heavy Industrial
WESTOVER HILLS, INC. By Roy Bechtol C814-75-002	Southeast corner of F.M. 2222 and Loop 360	From Interim "A" Residence 1st Height and Area To 361 single-family dwelling units with common open space and recreation area called "The Courtyard," a planned unit development.

CARL WOOTTEN
By Wroe Owens
C814-74-007
(revised)

Lakeshore Drive,
Westlake Drive, and
Lake Austin (Colorado
River)

From Interim "A" Residence
1st Height and Area and
"C" Commercial
1st Height and Area
To 76 attached and 131
detached single-family dwelling
units with restaurant, marina,
commercial area, and common
open space called, "Harbor
Village," a revised planned
unit development.

ADJOURNMENT

The Council adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

APPROVED



Mayor

ATTEST:



City Clerk